III. REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 9 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7 and 9 have been amended. The amendments to claims 1 and 7 are supported by page 9 lines 14-21 of Applicant's specification. The amendments to claims 3, 4, and 9 provide the appropriate reference to their respective independent claims subsequent to cancellation of dependent claims 2 and 8. Claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Weissman et al., US Patent Application Publication 2002/0156905 ("Weissman"). Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 USC 102(b) rejections for the reasons provided below.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3-5, 7 and 9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection over Weissman, Applicant asserts that Weissman does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Applicant submits that Weissman fails to teach each and every feature of claim 1, as amended, (and similarly independent claim 7).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "transmission from said proxy to a Single Sign On (SSO) server of said user request together with credentials associated with said user,

wherein said SSO server is external to and accessible via the Internet to said HTTP proxy." Weissman does not teach these features.

The Office cites paragraphs 22, 25, and 26 of Weissman in support of its allegation that Weissman teaches these features. Final Office Action p.3. However, these citations do not teach, *inter alia*, "SSO server is external to and accessible via the Internet to said HTTP proxy."

In response to the previous office action, Applicant submitted that Weissman does not teach a separate HTTP proxy and SSO server. Applicant Response January 9, 2008 p.6. In response to this argument, the Office cites paragraph 24 of Weissman alleging "the logon system is a client computer, portal computer and domain computer and later described as also multiple computer that comprise the system." Final Office Action p.2.

Applicant submits that paragraph 24 fails to teach the "SSO server is external to and accessible via the Internet to said HTTP proxy." "The logon system" referenced by paragraph 24 is the entirety of the Weissman disclosure. (See paragraph 19 of Weissman "A method and system for providing a single logon system for logging onto multiple server computers without modification of the server computers.") In other words, the Office cannot then point to the portal of Weissman and state that it is separate or external from the logon system because the portal is a component of the logon system. Therefore, Weissman does not teach the "SSO server is external to and accessible via the Internet to said HTTP proxy."

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "transmission by said content server to said SSO server of an HTTP response to said user request after the content server receives the

filled login form from said SSO server, wherein any session cookie augmenting the HTTP response is opaque to the SSO server and the HTTP proxy allowing the content server to verify proper identification of the user upon a subsequent request." Weissman does not teach these features.

The only citation to Weissman by the Office to support an allegation that Weissman teaches "cookies" is to paragraph 23. Final Office Action p.5 in response to dependent claim 5. Weissman states "the portal web site stores any cookies included in the message that accompanied the web page and removes those cookies before forwarding the web page to the client computer." Based upon this citation and to Weissman generally, Weissman does not teach "any session cookie augmenting the HTTP response is opaque to the SSO server and the HTTP proxy allowing the content server to verify proper identification of the user upon a subsequent request."

For these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, (and similarly claim 7) is not anticipated by Weissman.

With respect to the dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/David E. Rook/

Date: May 29, 2008

_____

David E. Rook
Reg. No.: 40,790

Hoffman, Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)